



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## II.—ὥς ἑκαστοι IN THUCYDIDES.

That more light is needed on the use of ὥς ἑκαστοι without a separate verb is evident from the number of passages containing it in which the reading has been disputed, whether the MSS vary or not, from the variety of renderings even for one and the same passage, and from the comments, in standard editions of Thucydides, upon sentences which, for one reason or another, are slightly obscure. Let us take, by way of illustration, Thuc. I. 15. 2: οὐδ' αὖ αὐτοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἑσθης κοινὰς στρατείας ἐποιούντο, κατ' ἀλλήλους δὲ μᾶλλον ὥς ἑκαστοι οἱ ἀστυγείτορες ἐπολέμουν. Upon this we read in Classen-Steup, "κατ' ἀλλήλους: unter einander d. h. ohne Beteiligung anderer; ὥς ἑκαστοι: Th. geht auf die näheren Umstände (Zeit, Ergebnis u. s. w.) jener Kämpfe nicht ein". Bloomfield says, "κατ' ἀλλήλους one with another, i. e. in an interchange of hostilities; ὥς ἑκαστοι stands antithetically to κοινὰς, the sense being *singulativim*, severally"; he translates, "but, rather, neighboring states severally pursued each other with hostilities". Smith's translation is, "each petty state took up arms *occasionally* in its own defence against the incroachments of its neighbors". Helmbold, who has made a special study<sup>1</sup> of ὥς ἑκαστοι and is cited with approval in Classen-Steup (on I. 3. 4), remarks on the present passage, "die einen so, die andern so d. h. die einen mit dem, die andern mit jenem Erfolge". We see, from this selection of comments and translations, that ὥς ἑκαστοι in this passage is taken by one to mean *occasionally*, by another to mean *severally*, by another to mean *with different results*, while Steup finds *time, result*, "und so weiter", all implied.

Before discussing the interpretation of I. 15. 2 I might formulate a rule upon the use of ὥς ἑκαστοι, which would run as follows: ὥς ἑκαστοι *divides the noun to which it refers* (generally the subject of the sentence) *into parts and implies that the different parts act in different ways, at different times, or in different places; or otherwise differently if the point of difference is implied by the context*. I am further of the opinion that but one point of difference is particularly involved at one time. Difference of place, for

<sup>1</sup> Über d. successive Entstehung d. Thuc. Geschichtswerkes, II. p. 31 ff.

example, may be the point emphasized without implication that the different members acting in different places acted at the same time; but if difference of place is emphasized, it is quite immaterial whether the time is different or not. In the majority of cases in Thucydides the point of difference is perfectly clear, because a definite piece of information is furnished about one or two members of a group, and then the other members of the group are lumped together with a *ὡς ἕκαστοι*, the information *on the same point* being withheld for them because it is not known, or is unimportant. For example take I. 48. 4; Κορινθίους δὲ τὸ μὲν δεξιὸν κέρασ αἱ Μεγαρίδες νῆες εἶχον καὶ αἱ Ἀμπρακιώτιδες, κατὰ δὲ τὸ μέσον οἱ ἄλλοι ξύμμαχοι ὡς ἕκαστοι. It is perfectly clear that *ὡς ἕκαστοι* in this case refers to *position* in line of battle; cp. III. 107. 4; VIII. 104. 3. Difference of *direction* is clearly indicated in V. 4. 3; of *time* by *ὡς ἐκάστη* (see below) in I. 98. 4; of *manner* in IV. 32. 2. With the last example, in which *ὡς ἕκαστοι* might be called an adverb of manner, I should group cases in which *ὡς ἕκαστοι* might be considered to be essentially the object, as well as the subject, of a transitive verb, or a cognate accusative with an intransitive or passive verb. For example, in καὶ ἄλλοι τε παριόντες ἐγκλήματα ἐποιούντο ὡς ἕκαστοι (I. 67. 4), *ὡς ἕκαστοι* is essentially both subject and object of ἐποιούντο, the meaning being *others made different charges each*; cp. VII. 65. 1. From a study of the various examples I am inclined to believe that differences of *time*, *place*, and *manner* (including under the last cases in which *ὡς ἕκαστοι* may be regarded as the object of the verb) may be implied by *ὡς ἕκαστοι* without the context being so clear as in the kind of example cited above; *cause* and *result*, however, must be very clearly indicated by the context. A good illustration of the wide meaning that may be contained in *ὡς ἕκαστοι*, when one or two members of a group are first referred to, is to be found in I. 107. 5; 113. 1; V. 57. 2. The first of these three examples runs as follows: ἐβοήθησαν δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πανδημεὶ καὶ Ἀργείων χίλιοι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ξυμμάχων ὡς ἕκαστοι. There can be no doubt<sup>1</sup> that *ὡς ἕκαστοι* here means *various numbers each*, *I need (or can) not say how many each of the other allies*. It is interesting to compare these examples in which *ὡς ἕκαστοι* refers to a difference in numbers with a passage in Herodotus, who is the only other writer before Aristotle that uses the idiomatic *ὡς ἕκαστοι*.

<sup>1</sup> Böhme, indeed, says "*ὡς ἕκαστοι* deutet auf die eilige Mobilmachung". For this Thuc. would probably have written: οἱ ἄλλοι ξύμμαχοι ὡς ἕκαστοι ἐδύναντο.

In Hdt. III. 159. 13 we have ἐπέταξε τοῖσι περιοίκοισι ἔθνεσι γυναῖκας ἐς Βαβυλῶνα κατιστάναι, ὅσας δὴ ἑκάστοισι ἐπιτάσσων. If this sentence had run "he appointed to the Medes five hundred, to the Sacians three hundred, to the others various numbers each", Thucydides would have written τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις ὥς ἑκάστοις, and not ὅσας δὴ ἑκάστοις. ὥς ἑκάστοις alone, in the sentence as it stands, would not clearly refer to *number*. Helmbold (l. c.) was right, for the general run of cases, when he made the statement, "angewandt wird diese Formel von Thuc. an solchen Stellen, wo er ein Eingehen auf gewisse Einzelheiten vermeiden will, entweder weil er sie als gleichgültig für seine Darstellung nicht geben will, oder weil er sie nicht geben kann". But he goes too far, and there are times when Classen's *singuli deinceps* as a translation for ὥς ἕκαστοι, which Helmbold particularly attacks, is of more assistance than his own rule. Sometimes ὥς ἕκαστοι is used when there is no "avoidance of going into certain particulars". In these cases the *point of difference* is not so clearly indicated as in those where the definite statement concerning one or two members of a group is made, and here there is most variation in interpretation and most doubt about the text. These cases I shall now discuss, beginning with the passage in I. 15. 2 cited above.

(1). Thuc. I. 15. 2: οὐδ' αὖ αὐτοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἴσης κοινὰς στρατείας ἐπιοῦντο, κατ' ἀλλήλους δὲ μᾶλλον ὥς ἕκαστοι οἱ ἀστυγείτονες ἐπολέμουν. The root of the difficulty in this sentence lies in the use of κατ' ἀλλήλους and ὥς ἕκαστοι together. What is the distinction between them? The line of argument, followed by some editors and translators, would seem to be that, since κατ' ἀλλήλους means *by themselves*, ὥς ἕκαστοι can not here mean *separately*, a mere repetition of the other; consequently it refers to a difference of *time* or *result*, or is a general *I need not go into particulars*. But ὥς ἕκαστοι had not become so indefinite as this. There is a reason in this sentence for its occurrence side by side with κατ' ἀλλήλους. The two phrases would not generally be found referring to the subject of the same sentence. They are in a way contradictory, because ὥς ἕκαστοι *divides* the subject into groups which are placed in contrast with one another, whereas κατ' ἀλλήλους *unites* in one group the persons to whom it refers in contrast to other persons. The reason why both phrases can be used in the present passage is that the subject οἱ ἀστυγείτονες is capable both of division and of union; one pair of neighbors can be contrasted with other pairs by ὥς ἕκαστοι, and neighbors, as such, can be united in contrast

to distant states by *κατ' ἀλλήλους*. The sentence means *the several states warred separately with their own neighbors*. *ὡς ἕκαστοι* not infrequently means *singly*, or *one here, one there*. That is the meaning here, but since it takes two to make neighbors, as well as two to make a quarrel, we might here translate *neighboring states warred together, two here, two there*. In this chapter Thucydides is pointing out that in the early history of Greece there were no great wars, involving a large number of states. A few lines above our sentence we read πάντες (οἱ πόλεμοι), ὅσοι καὶ ἐγένοντο, πρὸς ὁμόρους τοὺς σφετέρους ἑκάστοις. It is clear, therefore, that he has in mind small wars involving only two neighboring states. But it may be objected that this idea is sufficiently brought out by *κατ' ἀλλήλους οἱ ἀστυγείτονες ἐπολέμουν*, and that *ὡς ἕκαστοι* consequently adds to this *some at one time, some at another*. In answer to this it is to be observed that neither *ἀστυγείτονες* nor *κατ' ἀλλήλους* implies two and only two. It is *ὡς ἕκαστοι* alone that implies the separation into pairs. And further, the question of difference of time is not implied in the slightest degree by the context. The Spartans might have been fighting with the Messenians at the same time as the Athenians were with the Boeotians, and the conditions described by Thucydides still be fulfilled. The whole point is that of small *separate* wars between two states.

(2). Thuc. I. 89. 2: καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἀπέπλευσαν ἐξ Ἑλλησπόντου ὡς ἕκαστοι κατὰ πόλεις (subject οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου ξύμμαχοι). This sentence like the preceding, contains two phrases, *ὡς ἕκαστοι* and *κατὰ πόλεις*, which are somewhat difficult to distinguish. In this case there is no contradiction between the two, for both of them divide the subject. One must rather ask why they are both necessary. The note in Classen-Steup is this, "*ὡς ἕκαστοι* deutet darauf hin, dass nicht nur der Verband der Flotte aufhörte (*κατὰ πόλεις*), sondern auch die einzelnen Kontingente nicht zu gleicher Zeit den Hellespont verliessen". It appears to me, however, that it is a mistake to bring the *time* element into the sentence at all. The work of the expedition has ended with the capture of Sestos and the allies are now going home. It is quite as improbable that the several contingents sailed away at different times as that all left at exactly the same time. It is unnecessary to assume any further reference to *time* than is given us by *μετὰ τοῦτο*. The contingents are going to their several homes, and the difference of direction is expressed by *ὡς ἕκαστοι*. *κατὰ πόλεις* is necessary because the subject (οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰωνίας

καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου ξύμμαχοι), as it stands, is not sufficiently divided to suggest the number of directions the fleet took. Helmbold (l. c.) thinks that κατὰ πόλεις is a gloss; to me it seems more essential to clearness than ὥς ἕκαστοι. In this connection I might cite the example in III. 107. 4: ἐπεὶ δὲ παρεσκεύαστο ἀμφοτέροις, ἦσαν ἐς χεῖρας, Δημοσθένης μὲν τὸ δεξιὸν κέρας ἔχων μετὰ Μεσσηνίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων ὀλίγων· τὸ δὲ ἄλλο Ἀκαρνανες ὥς ἕκαστοι τεταγμένοι ἐπείχον καὶ Ἀμφιλόχων οἱ παρόντες ἀκοντισταί. In this sentence one feels the need of something to divide Ἀκαρνανες corresponding to κατὰ πόλεις in I. 89. The comment in Classen-Steup is "nach ihren Stämmen verteilt und unter ihren eigenen Führern". The only thing in the context to suggest the kind of division is οἱ δὲ Ἀκαρνανες καὶ Ἀμφιλόχων ὀλίγοι— ἡγεμόνα τοῦ παντός ξυμμαχικοῦ αἰροῦνται Δημοσθένη μετὰ τῶν σφετέρων στρατηγῶν (§ 2).

(3). Thuc. I. 98. 4: πρώτη τε αὕτη πόλις ξυμμαχίς παρὰ τὸ καθεστηκὸς ἐδουλώθη, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὥς ἐκάστη [ξυνέβη]. The MSS vary between ἐκάστη and ἐκάστη. All have συνέβη, but the Schol. ἀπὸ κοινοῦ ἐδουλώθη proves to some scholars that συνέβη was not originally there, while others are not convinced of this. To me the remark of the Scholiast seems entirely without point if he had συνέβη in his text; but on other grounds also I prefer to omit συνέβη. In the first clause a particular case is mentioned, and by the position of πρώτη emphasis is laid upon the *order* in which the allied states were enslaved; the second clause continues *and then each of the others in its turn, I need not go into particulars about the order*. ὥς ἐκάστη συνέβη seems to introduce other ideas like *cause* and *result*, which do not carry on the emphasized point of *order* in the first clause. The reference to ὥς ἐκάστοις συνέβαινε in III. 90. 1 gives no support to συνέβη here. On the contrary, since in III. 90 the context shows that ὥς ἐκάστοις συνέβαινε implies *result*, the passage supports the argument for the omission of συνέβη in I. 98. So, in IV. 4. 2, ὥς ἕκαστόν τι ξυμβαίνει *as each fitted* has a special meaning that could not be brought out by ὥς ἕκαστον alone. Consequently the passage has no bearing upon I. 98.

(4). Thuc. II. 21. 3: χρησμολόγοι τε ἦδον χρησμούς παντοίους, ὧν ἀκροῦσθαι ὥς ἕκαστος ὥρητο (v. l. ὥρητο). The MSS vary, *c* having ὥς, *b* omitting it. Some editors retain ὥς, others change it to εἰς, others omit it and change ὧν to ὥς. I find no difficulty in the reading ὥς ἕκαστος. Arnold translates "which they were severally eager to listen to", and comments, "Thuc. adds ὥς ἕκαστος ὥρῃ, because different persons ran to listen to different prophecies,

each choosing those which encouraged his own previous opinions or feelings". Such a meaning is entirely suited to the context and the interpretation is certainly legitimate. οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ὡς ἕκαστοι τῶν χρησμῶν ἠκροῶντο would mean *different groups of Athenians gave heed to different oracles*, just as ἄλλοι ἐγκλήματα ἐποιοῦντο ὡς ἕκαστοι (I. 67. 4) means *different ones made different charges*. We are therefore justified in translating II. 21, *different ones of which different individuals were eager to listen to*.

(5). Thuc. III. 74. 3: καὶ οἱ μὲν παυσάμενοι τῆς μάχης ὡς ἑκάτεροι ἡσυχάσαντες τὴν νύκτα ἐν φυλακῇ ἦσαν· καὶ ἡ Κορινθία ναῦς τοῦ δήμου κεκρατηκότος ὑπεξανήγετο κτέ. From the lack of comment upon this passage it would seem that no difficulty is found in it. Jowett's translation is *both parties now left off fighting, and kept watch in their own positions during the night*. I must confess that I do not see why Thucydides should say each of two hostile parties went to rest *in different places*. There would be some point in saying they went to rest each in the positions they occupied when the fighting ceased; but to bring out that idea ὡς ἑκάτεροι would need a verb of its own. It is in no way helpful to make ὡς ἑκάτεροι refer to difference of time, or to take it with either of the other verbs in the clause; ἑκάτεροι without ὡς would give the idea quite as well. Further, οἱ μὲν is not without its difficulty, and ἡσυχάσαντες ἐν φυλακῇ ἦσαν *having gone to rest they remained on guard* is not put quite as one would expect. Spratt seems to have found some difficulty here, for he says that ἡσυχάσαντες equals οὐδὲν κινήσαντες *without further attempt at hostilities*; but this idea is sufficiently expressed in παυσάμενοι τῆς μάχης. Reiske also, according to Poppo, "virgulam ante hoc verb. (ἡσυχάσαντες) poni vult". One might perhaps say *though they had quieted down they remained on guard*, but this hardly helps us with ὡς ἑκάτεροι. I can not escape the suspicion that the passage is corrupt. Poppo and Arnold note that C has ἡσυχάσαντες. That at least serves to indicate that there was some difficulty felt with ὡς ἑκάτεροι in early times. One might translate, with this reading, *and they, having ceased from battle each as if going to rest, remained on guard*. Both the difficulty in ὡς ἑκάτεροι and in ἡσυχάσαντες ἐν φυλακῇ ἦσαν would thus be removed; but the meaning is hardly satisfactory. Possibly the reading was something like καὶ οἱ μὲν παυσάμενοι τῆς μάχης ὡς ἑκάτεροι ἡσύχασαν, οἱ δὲ τὴν νύκτα ἐν φυλακῇ ἦσαν *and some having ceased from battle went to rest on either side, some remained on guard during the night*.

(6). Thuc. VI. 17. 4: καὶ οὐκ εἰκὸς τὸν τοιοῦτον ὄμιλον οὔτε λόγου μᾶ

γνώμη ἀκροᾶσθαι· οὔτε ἐς τὰ ἔργα κοινῶς τρέπεσθαι· ταχὺ δ' ἂν ὥς ἕκαστοι, εἴ τι καθ' ἡδονὴν λέγοιτο, προσχωροῖεν, ἄλλως τε καὶ εἰ στασιάζουσιν *different parties would take different sides according as anything was said to please them*. Böhme, Krüger, and others supply ἡμῖν with προσχωροῖεν. But this would mean *they would join us separately, or group by group*. The context is absolutely against such a meaning. Alcibiades is arguing that an expedition against Sicily is no such great undertaking as it appears, for, while the cities are populous, the inhabitants are mixed, shifting, unpatriotic, and quarreling among themselves; consequently they will not present a united front, but some can easily be induced to join the Athenians. It is entirely without point to say that they would come over to the Athenians separately, it being quite immaterial whether they came separately or not, provided they came. The whole point is that the Sicilians are so much broken up into parties that they are sure to take different sides, and so the Athenians can count upon some joining them out of opposition to the others.

(7). Thuc. VII. 74. 2: ταῖς δὲ ναυσὶ προσπλεύσαντες τὰς ναῦς τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰγυαλοῦ ἀφείλκον· ἐνέπερσαν δέ τινας ὀλίγας, ὥσπερ διανοήθησαν, αὐτοὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, τὰς δ' ἄλλας καθ' ἡσυχίαν οὐδενὸς κωλύοντος ὥς ἐκάστην ποι ἐκπεπτωκυῖαν ἀναδησάμενοι ἐκόμιζον ἐς τὴν πόλιν *they made fast to the rest wherever each had been run ashore*. This passage requires no particular comment, though Helmbold (l. c.) thinks that Thucydides must have written ὥς ἐκάστη ποι ἐκπεπτωκυῖα. It differs from other passages in the addition of ποι ἐκπεπτωκυῖαν to ὥς ἐκάστην. This addition makes it perfectly clear that the difference denoted by ὥς ἐκάστην is one of *place*; without it the meaning could be "they made fast to the others *one at a time*". For further remarks see below.

(8). Thuc. I. 3. 4: οἱ δ' οὖν ὥς ἕκαστοι Ἕλληνες κατὰ πόλεις τε ὅσοι ἀλλήλων ξυνίσταν καὶ ξύμπαντες ὕστερον κληθέντες οὐδὲν πρὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν δι' ἀσθένειαν καὶ ἀμειξίαν ἀλλήλων ἀθρόοι ἔπραξαν. This difficult passage has been much discussed. The translation offered in Classen-Steup is perhaps the most widely accepted interpretation; it will serve, at least, as well as another to bring out the points in dispute. It runs, "diejenigen nun also, welche der Reihe nach, und zwar zunächst immer diejenigen, welche sich einander in der Sprache verstanden, und hernach alle insgesamt, den Namen Hellenen erhalten haben". In the Appendix (p. 328) Steup raises the following objections to the text: (1). It is inconceivable that



ξύμπαντες should be used in a phrase explanatory of ὡς ἕκαστοι. (2). It is strange that, while the predicate of the sentence refers to the period before the Trojan war, the subject should describe the spread of the Greek name, which according to Thucydides took place largely in later times. (3). It is strange that, in a recapitulation of what has been said of the extension of the Greek name, the common language should be mentioned as a chief cause of growth, though this had not been referred to before. (4). If a common language were the cause of the extension of the name, this extension would not take place κατὰ πόλεις, since the political unit was not coextensive with the dialect unit. On these grounds Steup is inclined to reject κατὰ πόλεις—ὑστερον. Few, if any, will follow him in this; but the objections are at least strong enough to make it difficult to accept any interpretation that has been offered. The attempt to escape (cp. Böhme) the apparent conflict between ὡς ἕκαστοι and ὑστερον by making the former refer not to difference of *time* but to difference of *cause*—*for whatever reason each took the name*—is not successful because ὡς ἕκαστοι then comes in conflict with ὅσοι ἀλλήλων ξυνίεσαν, and Steup's second, third and fourth objections still remain. Besides there is good reason to doubt whether ὡς ἕκαστοι can refer to cause without the context clearly indicating cause, since none of the examples discussed above would admit of such a translation. The suggestion of Dobree to take ὡς ἕκαστοι with κατὰ πόλεις τε, in spite of the position of τε, is an illustration of the strength of Steup's first objection, yet does not touch the others. I cite the translation of Arnold because it brings out a couple of points upon which I wish to touch: *the several Hellenic communities (the name is an anachronism, but I mean) those who both in their separate cities were at first called Hellenes, from speaking a common Hellenic language, and afterwards were called so as the name of the whole nation.* Passing over, for the moment, the translation of ὡς ἕκαστοι simply by *several*, the clumsiness of the attempt to render τε—καί brings out strongly one of the chief difficulties in all interpretations hitherto offered. If κατὰ πόλεις and ξύμπαντες ὑστερον were really contrasted and the meaning were *at first to community after community, and finally to all collectively* we should not have τε—καί but κατὰ μὲν πόλεις (or πρῶτον μὲν κατὰ πόλεις), ὑστερον δὲ ξύμπαντες. The point where all translations have erred is in taking ὑστερον with ξύμπαντες. This inevitably suggests the idea of *at first* with κατὰ πόλεις, and, almost as inevitably, makes us think of *separate*

*times* in connection with ὥς ἕκαστοι. As a matter of fact ὕστερον belongs with κληθέντες, and affects the whole clause and not ξύμπαντες alone. Thucydides begins this chapter with the statement πρὸ γὰρ τῶν Τρωικῶν οὐδὲν φαίνεται πρότερον κοινῇ ἐργασαμένη ἡ Ἑλλάς. Then he tells us that the name Ἑλλάς did not in Trojan times apply to the whole country, and gives a lengthy explanation of its gradual extension. In our sentence he resumes with *At any rate those who were later called Hellenes*. This is precisely the subject the sentence needs (cp. Steup's second objection), for he wants to speak of the lack of common action on the part of a people, who have not yet a common name, but later were called Hellenes. The position of ὕστερον is just what it should be for the meaning suggested. By taking ὕστερον with κληθέντες we not only get the subject required, but are also relieved of the necessity of looking for μέν—δέ, and can seek the proper meaning of κατὰ πόλεις—ξύμπαντες. For this we must go back to § 2: Ἕλληνας δὲ καὶ τῶν παίδων αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ Φθιώτιδι ἰσχυσάντων, καὶ ἐπαγομένων αὐτοὺς ἐπ' ὠφελίᾳ ἔς τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις, καθ' ἑκάστους μὲν ἤδη τῇ ὁμιλίᾳ μᾶλλον καλεῖσθαι Ἕλληνας, οὐ μέντοι πολλοῦ γε χρόνου ἐδύνατο καὶ ἅπασιν ἐκκικῆσαι. "Homer", he continues, "is the best proof of this. For, though he lived long after the Trojan war, he nowhere gives this name to the whole body (of Greeks), nor indeed to any except those with Achilles from Phthiotis, who in fact were the first Hellenes, but calls them in his poem Danaans and Argives and Achaeans. He does not even speak of barbarians, because, as it seems to me, the Hellenes were not even in his time set apart under one name in contrast to the barbarians. *Be that as it may, the various peoples that were later called Greeks, and the name* (at this later time) *was applied both to separate communities on the basis of a common language and as a common name for all, did nothing in concert before the Trojan war*". It will be seen that the καθ' ἑκάστους of § 2 is resumed in § 4 with κατὰ πόλεις, the ἅπασιν with ξύμπαντες. In the time of Hellen and his descendants there is a contrast (μέν—μέντοι) between the separate communities acquiring the name, and the whole body; in the later time, when the name had won its way throughout the land, *both* separate communities *and* (τε—καί) the nation as a whole were called Hellenes. By this interpretation (assuming still that ὥς ἕκαστοι has been correctly translated) not only the first and second objections of Steup are removed, but also the third and fourth; for, when Thucydides says *the name is now applied to separate communities on the basis*

of a common language, he is not giving a new reason for the gradual extension of the name, but is describing the condition that had been reached in his own time, i. e., if a community spoke a Hellenic dialect it was called Hellenic. If any one thinks that Thucydides would not be likely to say that the name Hellenes was applied both to the whole nation and to its individual parts, that the distinction, in short, is too finely drawn, he should remember that the distinction has developed itself naturally from the argument of the chapter, and that, when a national feeling is just developing, the application of the national name to one of the states, in place of its old individual name, is a matter of slow growth.

It is now necessary to go back and discuss the question whether in the translation *the various peoples later called Hellenes* ὡς ἑκαστοι has been given its proper meaning. With the exception of Arnold and Jowett, who render ὡς ἑκαστοι simply by *the several tribes* without offering any defence of the rendering, all the authorities I have been able to consult take ὡς ἑκαστοι closely with κληθέντες and make it refer to the difference of time in taking the name, or to the different reasons. Now there can be no doubt that *those who were given the name Hellenes at different times* is in itself a perfectly possible rendering of the Greek, but the difficulty of reconciling ξύμπαντες ὕστερον with this meaning of ὡς ἑκαστοι has seemed to most scholars insurmountable. This difficulty is lessened if ὕστερον be taken with κληθέντες as I have suggested; but there is not much point in saying *the states that afterwards were given the name Hellenes one at a time did nothing in concert*. I believe there is another way out of the difficulty. While ὡς ἑκαστοι is regularly predicative in position, in such long attributive participial phrases, as we have here, predicative words frequently stand between the article and participle. It is therefore fair to assume that ὡς ἑκαστοι may be predicative here, in which case it belongs with ἐπραξαν rather than with κληθέντες. In that case it is correct to give the translation *the several races later called Hellenes did nothing in concert*? For οἱ ξύμμαχοι ὡς ἑκαστοι ἀπέπλευσαν it is not correct to say *the several allies sailed away*; ἑκαστοι alone would give that meaning. ὡς ἑκαστοι requires *the several allies sailed away separately*; for, as has been emphasized, ὡς ἑκαστοι implies that the different members of the subject act differently, or separately. As it happens, however, our predicate in the present sentence is *did nothing in concert*, which is but

another way of saying *acted separately*. ὥς ἕκαστοι and οὐδὲν ἄνθρωποι in the same sentence are simply a bit tautological. The usage may be justified by the following parallel in English. We can say *the several states did nothing in concert* but not *each state did nothing in concert* or *all the states did nothing in concert*. The word *several* is unnecessary in such a sentence, but the desire for the contrast between *several* and *in concert* makes it a common usage. There can be no objection to assuming a similar development in Greek, and the utilization of the distinction between ὥς ἕκαστοι and ἕκαστοι, corresponding to ours between *several* and *each*.

Another point of view that might be urged in defence of the interpretation suggested is the following. Our various examples have shown that ὥς ἕκαστοι generally follows a definite statement of particulars with an indefinite reference to time, place, manner, number, as the case may be. It means, frequently, *I need not say when, how, where, or how many*. There is no reason why it should not in the proper context also mean *I need not say who*. Now the article with the participle is an indefinite expression. οἱ Ἕλληνες ὕστερον κληθέντες is doubly indefinite because it might refer under certain conditions to a single race whose earlier name is not mentioned, but who, in contrast to some other, were later called Hellenes; or it might refer to a number of different races all later called Hellenes. In the latter case it might well be followed by such an expression as *I need not say who, I need not mention the name of each race* that later was included under the general name Hellenes.

Of the eight sentences that have been particularly discussed, two (I. 98. 4; VII. 74. 2) contain words that fix the reference of ὥς ἕκαστοι to *time* and *place*; in four (I. 3. 4; 15. 3; 89. 2; VI. 17. 4) difference of *place* or separate action (without the element of *time* being particularly involved) is to be inferred from the context; in one (II. 21. 3) the phrase is essentially the object of the verb as well as the subject (i. e. it contains both) and so implies that the different members of the subject did different things; in one passage the traditional reading has been called in question; but, if correct, difference of *place* is implied. In all other passages in Thucydides a definite statement concerning one or two members of the subject makes the *point of difference* for ὥς ἕκαστοι perfectly clear. In Herodotus there are only three examples of ὥς ἕκαστος without a verb. In VI. 31. 5 and VI. 79. 7

the meaning is clearly *one at a time*. I cite the third (I. 114. 5) in full for comparison with the usage of Thucydides: ὁ δὲ αὐτῶν διέταξε τοὺς μὲν οἰκίας οἰκοδομεῖν, τοὺς δὲ δορυφόρους εἶναι, τὸν δὲ κού τινα αὐτῶν ὀφθαλμὸν βασιλέος εἶναι, τῷ δὲ τινὶ τὰς ἀγγελίας φέρειν ἐδίδου γέρας, ὥς ἐκάστῳ ἔργον προστάσσω. Thucydides would probably have wound the sentence up with τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις ὥς ἐκάστοις, the number of particular examples making ἔργον unnecessary.

In dealing with ὥς ἕκαστοι grammarians and commentators commonly assert, by way of explanation, that the verb of the principal clause is to be supplied with it. According to Krüger, on Thuc. I. 3. 4, this is particularly clear from passages in which the phrase is in an oblique case. There can be no doubt that in origin the idiom goes back to forms with a verb expressed in the ὥς clause, but it is none the less true that, as a guide to the meaning in a particular passage, the statement is wholly valueless; in fact it is likely to mislead rather than to assist. In commenting upon Thuc. I. 113. 1 Helmbold (l. c.) makes the remark that ὥς ἕκαστοι in this passage "zu einem distributiven Indefinitum *jeweils so und so viel* erstarrt ist"; and yet he makes the restoration of the principal verb the basis of his treatment, and constantly restores the verb as a means of arriving at the meaning. Now it is safe to say that a phrase has reached a stereotyped form and spread in use beyond its original sphere, when the meaning is one that could not be easily seen by restoring the original form. If we take the example πεντήκοντα ὀπλίτας ὥς ἐκάστους ἀπέκτεινε (cp. Hdt. VI. 79. 7), we have a sentence which a Greek, we may feel sure, could understand as *he killed 50 hoplites one at a time*, without the aid of previous statements; but one unacquainted with the idiom would have great difficulty in reaching that meaning simply by repeating ἀπέκτεινε with ὥς ἐκάστους. Another indication of the stereotyped stage the phrase had reached may be found, I think, in the use of the plural ἕκαστοι where we might expect the singular ἕκαστος. It so happens that, in thirteen out of the eighteen cases in Thucydides, the plural is necessary because nations and other collective ideas are referred to. In the remaining five cases, though individuals are in question, the plural is twice used. Thus we have οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι στρατηγοὶ ὥς ἕκαστοι διετάξαντο (VIII. 104. 3), and πρὸς τε τὰλλα ἐξηρτύσαντο ὥς ἕκαστα καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο (VII. 65. 1). Of the three cases in Herodotus two have the singular, the third has the plural referring to an individual,—κατὰ πεντήκοντα δὴ ὧν τῶν Ἀργείων

ὥς ἑκάστους ἐκκαλεόμενος ὁ Κλεομένης ἔκτεινε VI. 79. 7.<sup>1</sup> In these three cases with the plural it is difficult to see how the verb of the principal sentence could be restored without requiring the singular. It is evident that the plural is used because ὥς ἕκαστοι is felt as an adjective qualifying στρατηγοί, τᾶλλα, and κατὰ πενήτηκοντα. In the five cases in Thucydides and Herodotus that have ὥς ἕκαστος in the singular, the plural could not be used without danger of obscuring the fact that a single individual and not a group is meant. In but one of these does ὥς ἕκαστος follow a plural noun with which it could agree, namely, in Thuc. VII. 74. 2: τὰς δ' ἄλλας (ναῦς)—ὥς ἑκάστην ποι ἐκπεπτωκυῖαν ἀναδησάμενοι. If the position of one or two ships had been previously indicated, I should expect here ὥς ἑκάστας without ποι ἐκπεπτωκυῖαν; but here that would be open to the meaning *they made fast to them one at a time*, so that the reference to *place* was necessary. In the lack of parallel examples it is impossible to determine whether the singular is necessary on account of these adjuncts, and why ὥς ἑκάστας ποι ἐκπεπτωκυῖας should not be used.

With regard to Krüger's remark that the necessity of supplying the principal verb is seen most clearly in those examples that have ὥς ἕκαστοι in an oblique case, it may be admitted that this method seems to give a satisfactory explanation of the case, though in πρὸς τε τᾶλλα ἐξηρτύσαντο ὥς ἕκαστα (VII. 65. 1) it would be necessary to supply πρὸς as well as the verb. On the other hand some of the examples with an oblique case indicate most clearly the idiomatic nature of the phrase. In ἐστράτευσαν ἐαυτῶν μὲν χιλίοις ὀπλίταις, τῶν δὲ ξυμμάχων ὥς ἑκάστοις (I. 113. 1) who can help feeling that ὥς ἑκάστοις is an indefinite distributive numeral (as Helmbold calls it)? Treating ὥς ἕκαστοι, then, as an indefinite distributive adjective or pronoun, we may say in general of its case that it agrees with the noun which it distributes except when the noun is in partitive dependence upon it as in I. 98. 4; 107. 5; 113. 1 (with which may be compared οἱ δ' ἄλλοι ὥς ἕκαστοι V. 57. 2). When ὥς ἕκαστοι refers equally to subject and object it is always nominative; so in ἄλλοι—ἐγκλήματα ἐποιοῦντο ὥς ἕκαστοι (I. 67. 4), where ὥς ἕκαστα in agreement with ἐγκλήματα, would theoretically be equally possible. On this ground it is evident that ὥς ἕκαστα in VII. 65. 1 was felt to be in agreement with τᾶλλα and not to be the object accusative of ἐξηρτύσαντο.

A. G. LAIRD.

<sup>1</sup> Sagawe, Über d. Gebrauch d. Pronomens ἕκαστος bei Herodot p. 5, and Van Herwerden (Mnem. XIII, p. 37) err in restoring ἕκαστον.